

REMARKS

Applicants' undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for her comments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this patent application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. Currently, Claims 1-37 are pending.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-37 have been examined with no claims being allowed. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 12-27, and 34-37, and have canceled Claims 5-11 and 28-33. No new matter has been added by this Amendment.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 5-7 in a Markush group, as well as including the techniques of "dipping" and "soaking" in the Markush group. Support for the added limitations of "dipping" and "soaking" is provided on page 9, lines 8-11, of the specification.

Claims 12-27 and 34-37 have been amended to depend from Claim 1.

No additional fee is due for this Amendment because the number of independent claims has been reduced and the total number of claims has been reduced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102**A. Boney et al.**

The rejection of Claims 8, 12, 13, 19-21, 28, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Boney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,932,495) is respectfully traversed. More particularly, Applicants have requested cancellation of Claims 8, 28, 32, and 33, and have amended Claims 12, 13, 19-21, and 34-37 to depend from Claim 1, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

B. Yahiaoui et al.

The rejection of Claims 8-12, 14, 15, 17-21, 28-32, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yahiaoui et al. (PCT Publication No. WO 98/09662) is respectfully traversed. More particularly, Applicants have requested

cancellation of Claims 8-11 and 28-32, and have amended Claims 12, 14, 15, 17-21, and 34-37 to depend from Claim 1, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

C. Stokes et al.

The rejection of Claims 8, 12, 14-16, 19-21, 28, 32, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stokes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,931,823) is respectfully traversed. More particularly, Applicants have requested cancellation of Claims 8, 28, and 32, and have amended Claims 12, 14-16, 19-21, and 34-37 to depend from Claim 1, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Boney et al. in view of Syverson

The rejection of Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boney et al. in view of Syverson (U.S. Patent No. 5,612,045) is respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 5-7 in a Markush group that also lists the techniques of “dipping” and “soaking.” As indicated by the Examiner, Boney et al. fail to disclose or suggest spraying, printing, or foaming the alkyl polyglycoside solution onto a nonwoven substrate. Furthermore, Boney et al. fail to disclose or suggest any other post-substrate-formation treatment techniques such as dipping or soaking. Syverson fails to overcome the deficiencies of Boney et al.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Boney et al. in view of Syverson fail to disclose or suggest Applicants’ claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Boney et al.

The rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Boney et al. is respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

Claim 14 has been amended to depend from Claim 1. As indicated by the Examiner, Boney et al. fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of spraying, printing, or foaming an alkyl polyglycoside solution onto a nonwoven substrate, as recited in amended Claim 1. Furthermore, Boney et al. fail to disclose or suggest any other post-substrate-formation treatment techniques such as dipping or soaking.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that Boney et al. fail to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

C. Yahiaoui et al.

The rejection of Claims 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahiaoui et al. is respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 22-27 have been amended to depend from Claim 1. Yahiaoui et al. fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of spraying, printing, or foaming an alkyl polyglycoside solution onto a nonwoven substrate, as recited in amended Claim 1. Furthermore, Boney et al. fail to disclose or suggest any other post-substrate-formation treatment techniques such as dipping or soaking.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that Yahiaoui et al. fail to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 5-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since each of these claims depends directly from Claim 1 without any intervening claims, each of the limitations of Claims 5-7 has been incorporated into Claim 1 in Markush format. Applicants have also included the techniques of "dipping" and "soaking" in the Markush group of Claim 1.

The statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter states that in the invention of Boney et al., the alkyl polyglycoside is added to the melt or to chitosan before the nonwoven webs are formed; thus, there is no teaching or suggestion of spraying, printing, or foaming the alkyl polyglycoside solution onto the nonwoven substrate. Like the spraying, printing, and foaming techniques, the techniques of dipping and soaking are also post-formation application techniques with respect to the nonwoven web. Therefore, Applicants believe that Boney et al. fail to disclose or suggest dipping or soaking the alkyl polyglycoside solution onto the nonwoven substrate.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicants believe Claim 1 and all claims depending from Claim 1 are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not addressed in this response, Applicants' undersigned attorney requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicants sincerely believe that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully request early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Melanie I. Rauch
Registration No. 40,924

Pauley Petersen Kinne & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road, Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195
(847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403